REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,928,644 issued to Kroening et al. Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

Kroening discloses a method of building a custom software configuration by combining like orders for information handling systems.

Kaliappan discloses a test generation means that builds a test for a target application using test techniques from a data storage means and an image builder, which converts description language of the test generation means to a desired language test program. The test generation means, target application, data storage means and image builder communicate through a network.

Claim 1 recites, in part, "an interface operable to accept image parameters from a builder through the Internet."

Claim 11 recites, in part, "accessing a library of plural image components by a customer through a remote network communication."

Kroening and Kaliappan cannot make obvious Claims 1 and 11 because Kroening and Kaliappan fail to teach, disclose or suggest all elements recited by Claims 1 and 11. For instance, Kroening and Kaliappan fail to teach, disclose or suggest "an interface operable to accept image parameters from a builder through the Internet" as recited by Claim 1 or "accessing a library of plural image components by a customer through a remote network communication" as recited by Claim 11. Kroening combines like orders to build common images but does not teach, disclose or suggest giving remote access of image building as is recited by Applicants' Claims. Kaliappan discloses an automatic test system for testing a remote target. Taken together or separately, Kroening and Kaliappan fail to teach, disclose or suggest accepting image parameters or components from a remote source to build an image for manufacture of an information handling system. Kaliappan does not address information handling system manufacture and teaches away from the elements recited by Claims 1 and 11. For example,

Kaliappan performs all aspects of the testing through remote interfaces, which offsets the advantages of Applicants' claimed invention. *See e.g.* page 4, lines 5-16. Accordingly, Kroening and Kaliappan cannot make obvious Claims 1-20 and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow all pending Claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

The Commissioner is authorized to deduct any additional fees which may be necessary and to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502264.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically submitted to the COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS via EFS on April 16, 2008.

/Robert W. Holland/

_____
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert W. Holland/

Robert W. Holland
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 40,020